

### III. REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 9, 16, and 20. Claims 4, 10, and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 24-26 have been added. As a result, claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 12-18, 20, 22 and 23-26 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claim. Applicants have herein amended the claim to provide proper antecedent basis.

Further, the Office rejects claims 1-4, 7-8, 16-19 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020055878), hereinafter “Burton,” in view of Uchida et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20050065859), hereinafter “Uchida.” Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicants assert that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as currently amended. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Burton in view of Uchida fails to teach or suggest the feature of “a request processing system for assigning approvers and suppliers to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests, wherein the approvers are distinct from the users initiating the item requests.” For instance, as currently amended for clarity, features of claim 4

are now included in independent claim 1. As claimed, approvers and suppliers are assigned to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests. The approvers are not the same as the users who are submitting an item request, but a distinct approver of the item request. In contrast, the Office points to Burton as teaching this feature. (Office Action, Page 6). However, as cited by the Office in reference to claim 4, Burton discloses a “confirm your order” and “submit” button. (Office Action, Page 4 citing Burton, Fig. 62). The Office equates a user ‘approving’ their own order with assigning approvers to user-initiated item requests and system-initiated item requests. As should be clear to one skilled in the art, a user submitting their own order is not the same as assigning approvers to user and system initiated item requests. However, for clarity, Applicants have amended the claim to clearly differentiate the user from the approver. Uchida does not remedy this deficiency.

With further regard to the rejections over Burton and Uchida, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “a data edit system for allowing the administrator to edit the data corresponding to the failed request queue, and the data corresponding to all of the system-initiated item requests and all of the user-initiated item requests.” For instance, the administrator in the current claim is allowed to edit data corresponding to item requests in the failed request queue and any of the system-initiated and user-initiated item requests. In contrast, Burton discloses that an administrator for “Group X” may add, delete, or edit content or features provided by an order module. (Burton, Para. 138). Changing available content and features for a group of users of an order module is not equivalent to editing data corresponding to item requests in the failed request queue and any system and user-initiated item requests. Uchida does not make any such disclosure either.

With further regard to the rejections over Burton and Uchida, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented separately and concurrently to the administrator in separate views within a single window without opening multiple windows.” Rather, the Office cites Burton’s Figures 81 and 86. Figure 81 is a display for administrative users to use when functioning in a customer service role to help users with orders. (Burton, Para. 455). The display does not separately and concurrently present a view of the failed request queue and the data. (Burton, Para. 456). Rather, it shows one attention item and a number of orders needing attention. This one item and a number is not a view of a failed request queue, much less a concurrent and separate view of the failed request queue and the data. Uchida does not make any such disclosure either.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of Burton and Uchida fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants’ independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 103(a) rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 7-8, which depend therefrom.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 16 over Burton in view of Uchida, Applicants assert that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the feature of “program code for processing the user-initiated requests and the system-initiated requests by assigning approvers and suppliers to the user-initiated item requests and the system-initiated item requests, wherein the approvers are distinct from the users initiating the item requests.” Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 16, and claims 17-18, 20, and 22-23 which depend therefrom.

Further, the Office rejects claims 5, 9-10, 12-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton and Uchida in further view of Joseph et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,603), hereinafter “Joseph.”

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Applicants note that the Office relies on its rejection of independent claims 1 and 16, from which these claims depend. To this extent, Applicants incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claims 1 and 16. Further, Applicants submit that the proposed addition of Joseph, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 15. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicants assert that the claim has been amended similarly to independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants assert that for at least the reasons stated above, the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 9. The addition of Joseph does not cure the above deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 9, and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom.

Further, the Office secondly rejects claims 1-4, 7-8, 16-19 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton in view of Uchida in further view of McFeely (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020184237). Applicants assert that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons given above with respect to independent claims 1 and 16 as being

unpatentable over Burton in view of Uchida, the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claim. McFeely does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above. Regarding the feature of “wherein the view of the failed request queue and the data are presented separately and concurrently to the administrator in separate views within a single window without opening multiple windows,” for which McFeely is referenced, Applicants assert that McFeely does not teach or suggest such a feature. Rather, the Office cites McFeely at Figures 3 and 6, as well as Para. 62. (Office Action, Page 17). However, Applicants note that McFeely discloses a tabbed browsing where a system displays an alerts portion separate from other portions, each portion being accessibly through tabs. This tabbed browsing fails to teach or suggest that the view of the failed request queue and the data are viewed separately and concurrently. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 7-8, which depend therefrom, as well as its rejection of claim 16, and claims 17-18, 20, and 22-23 which depend therefrom.

Further, the Office rejects claims 5, 9-10, 12-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton in view of Uchida in further view of Joseph and further view of McFeely.

Regarding claims 5 and 20, Applicants note that the Office relies on its rejection of independent claims 1 and 16, from which these claims depend. To this extent, Applicants incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claims 1 and 16. Further, Applicants submit that the proposed addition of Joseph, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 15. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Regarding independent claim 9, Applicants assert that the claim has been amended similarly to independent claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants assert that for at least the reasons stated above, the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 9. The addition of Joseph does not cure the above deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 9, and claims 12-15, which depend therefrom.

Regarding newly added claims 24-26, Applicants assert that none of the provided references, viewed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests that the system-initiated and user-initiated item requests do not include a designated supplier or a designated approver, or that the user-initiated item requests may include a suggested supplier.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan B. Davis/

Date: September 26, 2011

---

Nathan B. Davis  
Reg. No.: 67,474

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)